

B3 --16. The semiconductor device according to claim 7, the germanium film including at least one of a single-crystalline germanium, a polycrystalline germanium film and an amorphous germanium film in which p-type impurities are doped.

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 8-13 have previously been withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 7 are amended, and claims 15 and 16 are added. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The attached Appendix includes marked-up copies of each rewritten claim (37 C.F.R. §1.121(c)(1)(ii)).

I. THE CLAIMS DEFINE ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,101,247 to Ozturk et al. (hereinafter "Ozturk"); claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,216,271 to Takagi et al. (hereinafter "Takagi"); claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is unpatentable over Ozturk in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,249 to Gonzalez (hereinafter "Gonzalez"); and claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is unpatentable over Takagi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,227,333 to Shepard (hereinafter "Shepard"). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Ozturk and Takagi do not disclose a germanium film formed on the gate insulation film, as claimed in claims 1 and 7.

Instead, Ozturk discloses the germanium gate contact 26 formed on the thin film layer of polycrystalline silicon 25, which is between the germanium gate contact 26 and the gate oxide portion 22. In other words, the germanium gate contact 26 is not formed on the gate oxide portion 22.

Similarly, Takagi discloses that the germanium thin film 8 is formed on the silicone gate electrode 4, which is between the germanium thin film 8 and the gate insulating film 3. In other words, the germanium thin film 8 is not formed on the gate insulating film 3.

Further, Gonzalez and Shepard do not make up for the above deficiencies.

Because of the deficiencies discussed above, the applied art cannot provide advantages of the invention. For example, in accordance with claimed invention, a semiconductor device is provided which can prevent deterioration of carrier mobility and provides a high current driving ability.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 7 are distinguishable over the applied art. Further, the claims that depend from claims 1 and 7 are similarly distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons discussed above, its respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Eric D. Morehouse
Registration No. 38,565

JAO:EDM/gam

Attachments:

Appendix

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: July 8, 2002

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--